

RUMANIAN PAPER ATTACKS CIA AGENTS POSING AS PROFESSORS -- Bucharest,
Romania Libera, 18 May 66, p 6

Newspapers and personalities in the US seem to be uncovering with surprise the new unpleasant consequences which the US policy of intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, primarily in the affairs of Vietnam, has had for domestic affairs in the United States. This illustrates once again the connection between the methods and content of foreign policy and those of domestic policy. It is not only a question of loss of human life and pressures on the economy and the postponement of promised social projects, but also a question of subordinating, to a greater extent, the mechanism of domestic policy to the methods and goals of the policy of intervention. A US senator saw the violent and undemocratic reactions of official spokesman to the protest demonstrations against American action in Vietnam as a forerunner of the reappearance of McCarthyism of sad memory.

Shall we mention the discovery of another senator that leading agents of the CIA have begun to act within the United States just as they are acting in Saigon? The fact should be mentioned. The April issue of the influential US foreign policy review, Foreign Affairs, highlighted an article about the situation in South Vietnam signed by George A. Carver, Jr. The review introduced the author with the following words: "Specialist in political theory and Asian problems, graduate of Yale and Oxford Universities; former member of the American aid mission to Saigon; author of the book Aesthetics and Problems of Meanings. Impressive, is it not? A true professor with "noble" concerns. However, Senator Fulbright and several American newspapers found out that Prof George A. Carver, Jr. who concerns himself with "aesthetics"

and "aid" is a secret agent of CIA "working all the time" in this function. The senator asked: why was not the true identity of Carver revealed? Who did he intend to mislead? The CIA replied that Carver wrote the article in the capacity of a "private individual", in his free time, and not in the capacity of an exponent of the secret official position which he held. The New York Times said that it is difficult for a secret agent to make such a distinction of responsibilities. The newspaper took a stand against such practices using the following arguments: "The CIA, as the information agency for the United States, is limited, by its law of organization, to activity outside the country. It is not its business to try to influence or to color the views of domestic public opinion."

In other words, the agency is allowed to do what it wants overseas but at home.... This concept of lack of respect for other people has struck home against its own public opinion. For those in the CIA, all Americans who oppose the policy of the administration in Vietnam are a sort of domestic "Viet Cong". All the more suspect are some of them who consider that the Saigon regime is corrupt and that it is necessary to talk with the National Liberation Front.

No one can be surprised at the fact that, under such conditions, the CIA agents, under the guise of professors, are beginning to publish articles in leading American reviews in which they try to convince those who have time to listen that the South Vietnamese regime is a representative government and that the "persistent propaganda that the Americans are successors of the imperialists has not taken hold" in South Vietnam. It is amazing that despite the exorbitant sums of money which are allocated to CIA, they have not found a single expert who would warn that such procedures do not have a long life.

Not long ago, New Yorkers heard a Buddhist bonze, Thic Nhat Hanh, director of the institute of social studies in the Buddhist university in Saigon, say at a press conference held in New York, that the "Vietnamese peasants who see around them more Americans than there were French during the colonial period, have the impression that their country is controlled by foreigners." As we can see, the entrance of aesthetician Carver into the arena not only does not help the official policy but it gives it new and greater headaches. Such an episode is sufficient to illustrate the dilemma of the policy mentioned not to mention the fact that, out of so many university intellectuals in the United States, the only one that Foreign Affairs could find to defend the thesis of the administration is an espionage agent. This is only a small part of the experience gained "abroad" which has been brought back and integrated into American public life. -- N. Lupu